

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CLAUDIA VIDAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

NATIONWIDE AFFINITY INSURANCE
COMPANY AND NATIONWIDE
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:CV-15-791
(JUDGE CAPUTO)

MEMORANDUM

Presently before the Court is the Complaint filed by Plaintiff Claudia Vidal. (Doc. 1.) Because the Complaint fails to establish that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action, it will be dismissed unless Plaintiff can show that diversity jurisdiction is proper.

I. Background

Plaintiff commenced this action on April 22, 2015. Plaintiff alleges that this Court has jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (*Compl.*, ¶ 4.) Plaintiff is alleged to be an “individual residing at 2255 White Oak Drive, East Stroudsburg, PA 18301.” (*Id.* at ¶ 1.) Defendants Nationwide Affinity Insurance Company and Nationwide Insurance Company are alleged to be “insurance companies doing business in Pennsylvania with an address of One National Gateway, Dept. 5867, Des Moines, IA 50391-5867.” (*Id.* at ¶ 2.) Plaintiff “believes and therefore avers that Nationwide is an Ohio company, . . .” (*Id.* at ¶ 3.)

II. Analysis

Federal courts have an obligation to address issues of subject matter jurisdiction *sua sponte*. See *Shaffer v. GTE North, Inc.*, 284 F.3d 500, 502 (3d Cir.2002) (citing *Club*

Comanche, Inc. v. Gov't of the Virgin Islands, 278 F.3d 250, 255 (3d Cir. 2002)). Plaintiff alleges that the Court's basis for jurisdiction is pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). Section 1332(a)(1) gives district courts original jurisdiction to hear cases where the matter in controversy exceeds the value of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000) and is between citizens of different states. In order for jurisdiction to exist, there must be complete diversity, meaning that each defendant must be a citizen of a different state from each plaintiff. *Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 373, 98 S. Ct. 2396, 57 L. Ed. 2d 274 (1978). Of course, “[t]he person asserting jurisdiction bears the burden of showing that the case is properly before the court at all stages of the litigation.” *Packard v. Provident Nat'l Bank*, 994 F.2d 1039, 1045 (3d Cir. 1993).

“It is . . . well established that when jurisdiction depends upon diverse citizenship the absence of sufficient averments or of facts in the record showing such required diversity of citizenship is fatal and cannot be overlooked by the court, even if the parties fail to call attention to the defect, or consent that it may be waived.” *Thomas v. Bd. of Trs.*, 195 U.S. 207, 211, 25 S. Ct. 24, 49 L. Ed. 160 (1904). Moreover, “[w]hen the foundation of federal authority is, in a particular instance, open to question, it is incumbent upon the courts to resolve such doubts, one way or the other, before proceeding to a disposition of the merits.” *Carlsberg Res. Corp. v. Cambria Sav. & Loan Ass'n*, 554 F.2d 1254, 1256 (3d Cir. 1977); see also Fed R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

A. Citizenship of Plaintiff

The Complaint fails to adequately allege the citizenship of Plaintiff Vidal. For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a natural person is deemed to be a citizen of the state

where she is domiciled. *Swiger v. Allegheny Energy, Inc.*, 540 F.3d 179, 182 (3d Cir. 2008) (citing *Gilbert v. David*, 235 U.S. 561, 569, 35 S. Ct. 164, 59 L. Ed. 360 (1915)). To be domiciled in a state, a person must reside there and intend to remain indefinitely. *Krasnov v. Dinan*, 465 F.2d 1298, 1300-01 (3d Cir. 1972). A person may have only one domicile, and thus may be a citizen of only one state for diversity jurisdiction purposes. See *Williamson v. Osenton*, 232 U.S. 619, 34 S. Ct. 442, 58 L. Ed. 758 (1914).

To the extent the Complaint alleges that Vidal is currently “residing” in Pennsylvania, this is not sufficient. Residence is not the same as domicile and does not establish citizenship for diversity purposes. See *Krasnov*, 465 F.2d at 1300 (3d Cir. 1972) (“Where one lives is *prima facie* evidence of domicile, but mere residency in a state is insufficient for purposes of diversity”) (internal citations omitted). To properly plead diversity, Plaintiff must allege her state of citizenship, not merely her state of residence. As the Complaint does not contain this fact, the Court cannot determine whether subject matter jurisdiction exists.

B. Citizenship of Defendants

Plaintiff also fails to correctly plead the citizenship of Defendants. A corporation may have more than one state of citizenship: “a corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of every State . . . by which it has been incorporated and of the State . . . where it has its principal place of business.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1). A corporation may only have one principal place of business, and proper invocation of diversity jurisdiction requires that the plaintiff allege where a corporation has “its principal place of business.” See *S. Freedman & Co., Inc. v. Raab*, 180 F. App’x 316, 320 (3d Cir. 2006) (affirming the district court’s dismissal of a complaint alleging where the plaintiff corporation maintained “a principal place

of business,” rather than “its principal place of business”). A corporation’s principal place of business is its “nerve center,” that is, the place “where a corporation’s officers direct, control, and coordinate the corporation’s activities.” *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 130 S. Ct. 1181, 1192, 175 L. Ed. 2d 1029 (2010).

Here, the Complaint does not identify Defendants’ principal place of business or state of incorporation. Because the Complaint does not contain these facts, the Court cannot determine whether there is proper jurisdiction over this action.

III. Conclusion

Because the Court cannot determine whether subject matter jurisdiction exists, the matter is subject to dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3). However, Plaintiff will be given an opportunity to amend the Complaint and show that diversity of citizenship jurisdiction exists. Plaintiff will be granted twenty-one (21) days in which to file an amended complaint. Failure to do so will result in this action being dismissed.

An appropriate order follows.

April 24, 2015
Date

/s/ A. Richard Caputo
A. Richard Caputo
United States District Judge